

The Honorable James L. Robart

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JOHN DOE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD TRUMP, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:17-cv-00178JLR

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SEAL AND
CROSS-MOTION TO CONTINUE
SEAL**

(RELATING TO BOTH CASES)

JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE OF
SEATTLE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD TRUMP, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:17-cv-01707JLR

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Local Civil Rule 5(g)(3),
2 Defendants respond to Plaintiffs' Motion to Seal, ECF No. 184, and also respectfully move this
3 Court to order that the materials filed under seal by Plaintiffs in connection with Plaintiffs'
4 February 19, 2019, letter brief remain under seal. The information in question, if disclosed
5 publicly, would suggest the identity of a country listed on the Security Advisory Opinion
6 ("SAO") list—information that this Court has previously protected from public disclosure in
7 this case.

8
9 Specifically, in its Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiffs' Joint Motion to
10 Compel, ECF No. 171, the Court addressed the parties' dispute concerning "information that
11 would tend to reveal the names of the SAO countries." *Id.* at 23. Although Plaintiffs
12 "complain[ed] that the 'attorneys' eyes only' protective order offered by Defendants [was]
13 overly strict," the Court ordered that Defendants were "only required to" "produce the SAO
14 information" "pursuant to a protective order[.]" *Id.* at 24.

15
16 The same information is again at issue now. Plaintiffs redacted from their February 19,
17 2019, letter brief and attached Exhibit A references to one particular country, and a reasonable
18 person reading those references in context would discern that the country mentioned is an SAO
19 country. *See, e.g.,* Ex. A to Pls.' Letter Br., ECF No. 183-1, at 104:2-3 (discussing the country
20 in the context of a question about SAO nationals). Accordingly, because disclosure of the
21 redacted material could reveal law enforcement sensitive information, the Court should order
22 the unredacted copies remain under seal.

23
24 In the Ninth Circuit, there is an exception to the strong preference for public access to a
25 judicial record where, as here, the materials in question are "tangentially related to the merits of
26 a case," such as "sealed materials attached to a discovery motion unrelated to the merits of a

case[.]” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097-1101 (9th Cir. 2016);
 see also *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[F]or a
 sealed discovery document [attached] to a non-dispositive motion . . . the usual presumption of
 the public’s right of access is rebutted.” (internal quotation marks omitted; second alteration in
 original)). For such materials, “a party need only satisfy the less exacting ‘good cause’
 standard” to justify filing under seal. *Ctr. For Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097. Here, the good
 cause standard is met because disclosure of the sealed information could reveal law enforcement
 sensitive information. See Decl. of J. Neal Latta in Supp. of Defs.’ Opp’n to Pls.’ Joint Mot. to
 Compel, ECF No. 169-2. Moreover, Defendants have complied with Local Civil Rule
 5(g)(3)(A), which requires that the parties “explore redaction and other alternatives to filing
 under seal.” Here, minimally redacted versions of the sealed documents have already been filed
 on the public docket. See ECF Nos. 183, 183-1.

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(g)(3), on February 19, 2019, counsel for Defendants
 conferred with Plaintiffs’ counsel concerning the materials at issue. The conference took place
 via e-mail between Mariko Hirose, counsel for Plaintiffs, and Joseph Dugan, counsel for
 Defendants, with other counsel copied. Defense counsel understands both from that e-mail
 communication and from Plaintiffs’ submission that Plaintiffs oppose Defendants’ request
 herein.

Dated: February 19, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH H. HUNT
 Assistant Attorney General

AUGUST E. FLENTJE
 Special Counsel

JENNIFER D. RICKETTS
Director, Federal Programs Branch

JOHN R. TYLER
Assistant Director, Federal Programs Branch

/s/ Joseph C. Dugan
KEVIN SNELL
JOSEPH C. DUGAN
Trial Attorneys
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street, NW, Ste. 11212
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 514-3259
Fax: (202) 616-8460
Email: Joseph.Dugan@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on February 19, 2019, a copy of the foregoing document was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record.

DATED February 19, 2019.

/s/ Joseph C. Dugan
JOSEPH C. DUGAN